HUMAN EVENTS

Vol. XV, No. 51 Monday, December 22, 1958 Washington, D. C.

News Section *Printed in Two Sections*

GOP: *"Liberal" uprising checked* ..... (page 1)

LABOR: *Index to Reuther's power* ..... (page 1)

More on contributions ..... (page 2)

VENEZUELA: *Where Betancourt stands* ..... (page 2)

CLERGY: *How NCC aids Red line* ..... (page 3)

Inside the GOP: As of this week, conservatives hold a safe edge in their developing conflict with the Modern Republicans over the leadership of the party in the Senate. As close observers assess the struggle, the right wing stays ahead not only because of *force majeure*—a majority of the votes—but also because of the miserable showing of the "moderns" in the recent Senatorial elections.

There are some watchers who believe the insurgent effort led by Senators John Sherman Cooper (Ky.) and George Aiken (Vt.) has been largely instigated by the usual clique of left-wing Washington columnists, who are in fact "liberal" Democrats and have worked for the past five years for the destruction of the GOP—a phenomenon described in "Eisenhower's Fatal Legacy to the GOP," in Article Section I of this issue of HUMAN EVENTS.

Various circumstances point up the troubles of the "insurgent moderns." Ironically, although they are often called "Eisenhower Republicans," they have recently had little access to the White House. Called in for last week's key conference with Ike on the coming session's Budget problem were Senators Styles Bridges (N.H.), Everett Dirksen (Ill.) and Leverett Saltonstall (Mass.), and Representatives Martin (Mass.), Halleck (Ind.), Arends (Ill.) and Allen (Ill.). Of these, only Saltonstall is generally classified as a "modern," and he is not rated as extremely "liberal."

Senator Bridges appears to have been the leading figure in the conference. The next morning Bridges breakfasted alone with Ike, before leaving for his home state. It is reported that subsequently Ike got in touch with some of the "moderns" and warned them not to impair party harmony.

Senator Dirksen, whom most observers believe will be elected Leader at the Senate GOP caucus just before Congress opens, is said to be altering his previous statement which the press reported as opposing retention of Rule 22—the rule that now permits filibustering. ("Liberals" have sworn to abolish Rule 22 or to modify it drastically at the opening of the coming session.) Dirksen, it is said, claims his earlier statement against Rule 22 was inaccurately interpreted in the press. It is known that Bridges and other conservative Republicans who have no little influence on Dirksen insist on cooperation with the conservative Southern Democrats—in a rebirth of the "old coalition" which the late Senator Taft forged and maintained for so many years.

● The "liberal" move to seize the reins of leadership is an ironic aftermath to this fall's disastrous elections. For if there is one area in which the "moderns" emphatically ran far behind their conservative GOP colleagues, it was in the campaign for the Senate.

Symbolic of this observation is the fact that the man whom the "liberals" last proposed for a high post in the GOP leadership, Senator Edward J. Thye of Minnesota, was soundly trounced in his bid for re-election to the Upper Chamber. All told, the tally for Senate races shows at the most five conservatives losing their bids for election, with no less than eight candidates of various degrees of "liberalness" or subservience to the White House going down to defeat. The eight: Kean, Knight, Payne, Potter, Purtell, Revercomb, Thye, Watkins. (See HUMAN EVENTS for November 10, 1958.)

Humphrey: Minnesota Senator Hubert Humphrey's "mission to Moscow" becomes more comprehensible as detailed reports of his activities leak from the State Department. It is known that Humphrey brought back from Moscow a memorandum, the size of a small volume, containing a list of the various industrial materials and machinery which Soviet industry needed, and gave it to Under Secretary of State Christian Herter. The Soviets seek to buy these materials in the United States and want credits to underwrite the purchase, to the amount of approximately $3 billion.

It is rumored that Humphrey, when he was closeted with President Eisenhower, told Ike of Soviet official Anastas Mikoyan's desire to visit the United States and persuaded the President to order issuance of a visa to the Russian commissar. The real object of Mikoyan's trip to the US would be to arrange purchase of the materials listed in the memorandum Humphrey turned over to Herter.

Labor in Politics: The labor bosses not only have extended their sway over legislators in their home districts, where a substantial number of candidates can trace their election to union financial and political help; they may also—according to one instance—have started a movement to place their officials as secretaries and staff people to Members of Congress—possibly to insure 100 per cent submission to their will by their political debtors.

Democratic Congressman-elect Gerald Flynn, who in January will assume the seat of the late Lawrence Smith (representing Wisconsin's 2nd District), has just appointed a high-ranking United Auto Workers union official as his Administrative Assistant. (In Congressional offices, the "AA" runs the office for the Member.)

Published weekly at 408 First Street, SE, Washington 3, D. C.

• Copyright 1958 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The appointee, Samuel Rizzo, is a UAW international representative, and Chairman of the UAW's Midwestern Foundry Subcouncil. Rizzo takes the job with a special dispensation from Walter Reuther, who granted him a leave of absence from his UAW post. HUMAN EVENTS sources in the Badger State say that old-line Democrats there are fuming over the Rizzo appointment. He has several times been rejected by Wisconsin Democrats when he sought election to party offices, and has succeeded in obtaining posts chiefly through the appointive process. Capitol Hill asks: was Flynn forced to take Rizzo as AA, or did he do so voluntarily?

Election Contributions: HUMAN EVENTS can report another noteworthy instance of the labor bosses' strategy in covering up the total amount of money they spend in elections. Last week, this publication showed how Democrat John Foley, the victorious labor-backed candidate in Maryland's Sixth Congressional District, filed expenditures of only $620 with the Clerk of the Federal House of Representatives, while filing $18,738 at the County Courthouse in his Maryland district (in short, about 30 times as much as that listed with the Federal authorities).

This week, our investigators took a look at the key Congressional race in the First District of South Dakota, where left-wing Democrat George McGovern was challenged, unsuccessfully, by former Governor Joe Foss. McGovern, recipient of heavy labor backing, followed the practice of filing a relatively small amount with the Federal authorities, and a much larger one back home in South Dakota.

In his statement with the Clerk of the House, McGovern listed only $6554 in contributions; but with the Secretary of State in South Dakota, he filed nearly twice as much—$11,442. Republican Foss, in contrast, filed exactly the same amounts in South Dakota and in Washington: $4301.

● Further peculiarities in McGovern's financial statement appear when it is compared with the declarations made by labor groups concerning their contribution record. His statement filed in Pierre lists only $2000 from COPE, and his statement in Washington lists no COPE contributions whatever. Yet COPE's own statement to the Clerk of the House reflects *two* $2000 contributions to McGovern, not one.

McGovern's South Dakota statement lists nothing given him by Railway Labor's Political League; his Federal statement includes one $500 contribution. Yet Railway Labor's own statement includes two separate $500 contributions to McGovern's campaign.

Nuclear Tests: Appeasement forces in the Government and press corps are working overtime to achieve some kind of agreement to halt American nuclear tests—a step which military men fear would be suicidal, since it would halt US development of many vital weapons. Directly to the point of the current controversy are the remarks made last month by a man who has frequently lined up with the "liberals" on matters of atomic policy—former AEC Commissioner Thomas Murray.

Murray declared that the drive to ban nuclear testing programs has come about because the public is in "the grip of unreasoning and undiscriminating fear of all kinds of nuclear tests." Today, he said, "our security depends vitally on continued progress in perfecting the technology of small weapons, and this program cannot be assured without tests."

● Two series of atomic talks have been under way: one on nuclear testing, and one on the possibility of preventing surprise nuclear attacks (this conference was recessed last week). Both are headed by functionaries whose beginnings on the Government payroll date to the New and Fair Deals.

Heading our team of talkers on nuclear tests is James J. Wadsworth, who holds the post of US Representative on Disarmament. Under the Truman regime, Wadsworth, a nominal Republican, was almost continuously on the patronage payroll. He began as director of a division in the War Assets Administration (1945-46), served in the foreign aid agency (1948-50), was US senior representative on US-Canadian Joint Civil Defense (1950), director of an office in the National Security Resources Board (1950), and was hired as a deputy administrator and acting administrator in the Federal Civil Defense Administration (1950-53).

(Wadsworth, later serving as a member of the US delegation to the UN, tried to dissuade angry South Americans from moving to oust the Soviet puppet delegation which pretends to represent Hungary in the international body.)

The "surprise attack" talks are under the supervision of William C. Foster, who has an even more lustrous record as a Trumanesque bureaucrat. Foster's appointment recalls the almost constant promotion he has received at the hands of the Eisenhower Administration, and puts in point a news item that HUMAN EVENTS featured in its issue of June 2, 1958, recounting Foster's Fair Dealing career:

"His star began to climb in 1946 when Harry Truman appointed him to the War Department's Policy Committee on Labor-Management Relations. He then went to the Commerce Department under Henry Wallace and would have been Assistant to the Secretary in charge of small business had not Congress objected.

"Congress notwithstanding, Foster's star continued in the ascendant. When Averell Harriman became Secretary of Commerce he made Foster Under Secretary, and in 1950 Foster [became] director of ECA."

Venezuela Story: Slowly unfolding facts about subversion in the Caribbean area suggest that Americans are having the wool pulled over their eyes about what is happening along this US frontier. Discussions of Latin American radicalism often toss up the name of Romulo Betancourt, recently elected President of Venezuela—where US firms have an investment of $3.5 billion. Betancourt is being portrayed in most of the American press as a "moderate" leftist, of "anti-Communist" tendency. This picture, according to available evidence, is highly inaccurate.

Like fellow revolutionary Fidel Castro, Betancourt is a kind of all-purpose agitator in the Caribbean. "I state without fear of challenge," declared Representative

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Gardner Withrow (R.-Wis.) at the last session of Congress, "that Mr. Betancourt, of Venezuela, has fomented revolution not only there, but everywhere in the Americas."

Betancourt's record can be traced back for over 20 years. In 1934, he was expelled from Costa Rica as a Communist. In September, 1934, Betancourt himself wrote these lines to the Costa Rican newspaper, *La Hora*: "I am not the 'intellectual director of communism in Costa Rica.' The Communist party has its collective administration, the Central Committee of which I do not form a part. This does not mean that I deny my Communist affiliation. I am and shall be a Communist."

Betancourt has often been the beneficiary of the "whitewash" treatment in the US. Although the responsible officials acknowledged familiarity with his Red background, the US State Department in 1951 gave him a clean bill of health. The current line is that Betancourt's Red affiliation was a youthful indiscretion, and that he is now a strong anti-Communist.

Congressman Carroll Reece (R.-Tenn.) declared, during the last session, that Betancourt was an "experienced revolutionary, admits to having once been a member of the Communist party and was, in large part, responsible for the Bogota riots of 1948, which almost cost the life of General George Marshall." Reece added that Betancourt, "following the overthrow of Jimenez, returned to Caracas, bringing with him a large radical element which, according to numerous press reports, included many Communists. . . "

Senator Olin Johnston (D.-S.C.), in a 1957 report to the Internal Security Subcommittee, called Betancourt the "communistic leader of all Latin America."

Bound Volumes for 1958—indexed—may now be ordered for March delivery. Regularly $15. The special pre-publication price of $7.50 will be accepted until December 31. These handsome volumes make a valuable addition to your library. Volumes for 1955, 1956 and 1957 available at regular price ($15).

National Council of Churches: Far left-wing elements in the National Council of Churches handed the Kremlin a gold-plated propaganda victory recently when a "World Order Study Conference" of the NCC voted in favor of recognizing Red China (see HUMAN EVENTS for December 1, 1958). What hasn't been told is the real story behind the so-called "unanimous vote" of the Conference, which enabled the Communist *Worker* to declare: "38 Million Protestants Tell Ike: Recognize China."

The gimmick in the "unanimous" vote was that it wasn't unanimous at all; in fact, a sizeable minority of the Conference, amounting to close to a quarter of the 600 delegates there, opposed the Red China recognition move. The result was nevertheless handed down as one in which there were no dissenters, enabling the *Worker* to trumpet that high officials of Protestantism were "unanimous" in truckling to the Red propaganda line. This sleight-of-hand was made possible by NCC Study Conference rules which say that dissent must be noted only when more than 25 per cent of the delegates at a meeting disagree. An enlightening example of how "group dynamics" techniques can dovetail with the propaganda interests of the Communist party.

● Another incident putting the NCC in the news is the fact that its President, Dr. Edwin T. Dahlberg, is to visit US armed forces in Spain and North Africa over the Christmas holidays. Dahlberg, whose Communist-front record is extensive, has gone on record in favor of a brand of pacifism that repudiates the very concept of having armed forces.

As a member of the National Committee of the Church Peace Mission, Dahlberg helped secure signatures for a pacifist pledge which stated: "I hereby affirm (reaffirm) my refusal to make or to use the weapons of war; and my purpose to do my utmost to win other Christians to join in this stand and to bring the Church of Christ throughout the world to break with war."

How can a man who attempted to get signatories for this statement—asks the anti-Communist American Council of Christian Churches—be deemed an appropriate emissary to US fighting men abroad?

Soapy Plays Politics: Behind the recent and well-publicized action of Michigan Governor G. Mennen Williams of Michigan—allowing extradition of a UAW goon to neighboring Wisconsin for trial on a charge of criminal assault—lies a sensational story which has received little notice in the national press, but which HUMAN EVENTS has pieced together from sources in the Midwest.

On the day of Williams' announcement that he would allow the extradition of Reuther hireling John Gunaca, for an assault charge incurred in the famous Kohler strike, Chicago newscaster Bob Siegrist revealed that political soundings about the effects of such action had first been taken by interested Michigan Democrats. Siegrist relayed the remarks of Bud Mathieu, Secretary of the Association of Commerce of Sheboygan, Wis., concerning the feelers advanced to him about the impact of the Gunaca fracas on Governor Williams' political career. The questioners were reporters of the Marshall, Michigan, *Chronicle*, a Democratic paper whose publisher is close to Williams. "They pointed out to me when they called up," Mathieu said, "that they were a Democratic newspaper interested in the Governor's [Presidential] candidacy in '60."

A similar story was subsequently released by the Lansing, Michigan, *State Journal*. The paper reported that Williams had asked the publisher of the Marshall *Chronicle* to make inquiries about sentiment in Wisconsin. Williams, however, denied that he had commissioned the paper to take soundings about his own popularity with the voters in the area, saying he merely wanted a rundown on "tensions" there before deciding to send Gunaca back. (Meanwhile, the principal witness, Gunaca's alleged victim, has died; other necessary witnesses may have moved away, or their recollection of the incident may be dim enough for the defense counsel to challenge the accuracy of their testimony.)

The *Detroit Free Press* observes that the Gunaca extradition looked to some observers like "the opening move in Governor Williams' campaign for the Demo-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cratic Presidential nomination"—and that those assessing his motives will argue that Williams "will do whatever is necessary to disassociate himself from the idea that he is the puppet of the CIO in order to strengthen his position as a possible Presidential candidate.

"It will be the opinion of many that the trimming down of his usually high vote margin in the November election threw a scare into him, and convinced him that the UAW label which served him so well before has now become something of a political liability."

US Prisoners of Reds: Legislators returning to the Capital express their anger over US inaction concerning the 17-man crew of an Air Force transport which crashed in Soviet Armenia, September 2. Six bodies (which our medical specialists have been unable to identify) have been turned over by the Soviets. The Administration has taken no positive action to rescue the remainder of the crew, and the incident has received practically no coverage in the press.

There have been no public protests whatever from Ike or any of his underlings. Instead, the US has engaged in courteous "negotiations" with the Reds, supposedly appealing to their "humanitarian" impulses. Three polite written queries and several oral ones have been delivered to the Kremlin. No satisfactory answer has been forthcoming.

It looks today as if these American servicemen will meet the same fate as have the 944 American prisoners whom the Administration abandoned in Red China. US officials—as HUMAN EVENTS exclusively reported in its issue of July 14, 1958—arbitrarily chopped the number of captives in half to appease the Communists, and since that action have "been quietly diminishing the number of imprisoned US soldiers by the simple expedient of writing them off as dead."

Eric Johnston: Unfazed by the public spanking he received on the occasion of his sally, early this year, on behalf of foreign aid, promoter Eric Johnston recently pushed back into the news with his program for motion-picture exchanges between America and the Soviet Union —and called down another storm of protest on his head. As chief of the US Motion Picture Association, Johnston closed the official agreement in behalf of our State Department.

The "cultural exchange" deal with the Soviets, it is known, has stirred considerable opposition in the film industry, since many people fear that such an exchange could work only to the advantage of the Reds. Reasons: they have a widespread choice of "realistic" US films—many produced by people of shadowy loyalties—which specialize in showing American life at its worst; such Soviet films as might get into our hands, however, will be guaranteed 100 per cent propaganda vehicles.

It is noteworthy that USIA official Turner Shelton, assisting Johnston with the film-exchange deal, once argued before a House Appropriations subcommittee that Soviet films were dangerous instruments of Red propaganda.

Morse: Oregon's left-wing Democrat, Senator Wayne Morse, erupted into the news last week with a new feud —this time with his gardener. Morse fired the gardener, one D. F. Pickert, because Pickert had expressed admiration for President Eisenhower. Two people could not work in close harmony, Morse said, when their political beliefs were so violently opposed.

(Morse, who has been in the forefront of those demanding a Federally enforced minimum wage of $1.25 an hour, paid Pickert $1 an hour.)

Book Event: *The Ugly American*, by William J. Lederer and Eugene Burdick, Norton, 285 pages, $3.75. Reviewed by Eugene W. Castle. Condensed from the *American Mercury* for January, 1959.

For several years now, I have been going up and down the country, from Boston to San Francisco, from Miami to Chicago, in an effort to tell the American people of the folly of our foreign-aid program, and the failure of our information service abroad. Yet, I must admit, the accomplishment has not been great. Year after year, funds are voted by the House and Senate—in the millions for the US Information Agency and in the billions for the International Cooperation Administration (foreign aid)—to extend and perpetuate these harmful Government devices.

Now, a new book appears, by William J. Lederer and Eugene Burdick, which fictionalizes and dramatizes the things I have been warning about for so long. And this book, *The Ugly American*, may be the answer. Solidly based on fact, it presents a bitter protest against the way we operate our foreign-aid program and the way we are fighting the cold war. It proves we are doing everything the wrong way and unless we stop it "we might as well pull out before we're thrown out."

The Ugly American is one of a dual choice of the Book-of-the-Month Club and therefore assured of a wide readership. But I believe its message will spread even wider—it might even penetrate the bureaucrats in Washington. That is something I have been unable to do, and I wish it well.

All books reviewed or condensed in HUMAN EVENTS can be obtained, at the bookstore price, from The Bookmailer, Box 101, Murray Hill Station, New York 16, N. Y.

CHARLES A. WILLOUGHBY, Major General, US Army (Retd.): "HUMAN EVENTS is a healthy antidote to the systematic 'brainwashing' by proponents of state-social'sm and world government."

Additional copies of 4-page News Section or Article Section: single copy 20c (coins, not stamps); 10 copies $1; 25 copies $2; 100 copies $5; 500 copies $20; 1000 copies $30. In lots of 5000 $25 per thousand. Unless otherwise ordered, reprints are sent by fourth-class mail which takes ten days to two weeks for delivery. For first-class mail delivery, add one cent a copy; for airmail, add two cents a copy.

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTIONS to HUMAN EVENTS for new subscribers only: 5 weeks $1.

Yearly rate, $11; 6 months, $6; 3 months, $3.

By first class mail, $13 a year; by airmail (including APO and FPO) $15 a year. FOREIGN: $14 a year; airmail, Europe, Latin America, $21 a year; airmail, Asia, Africa and Pacific, $36 a year.

Bound Annual Volume with complete index, $15. Only 1955, 1956, and 1957 volumes available.

For change of address send old address (exactly as it appears on the envelope of your copy of HUMAN EVENTS) and new address (with zone number if any). Allow us 2 weeks to process new subscriptions and changes of address.

The Declaration of Independence opens: "When in the course of HUMAN EVENTS . . ."

HUMAN EVENTS, 408 First St., SE, Washington 3, D. C., is a weekly Washington newsletter. Founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. Published usually in two sections: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article section. Entered as second-class matter, Washington, D. C. Copyright 1958.

FRANK C. HANIGHEN, *Editor and Publisher* JAMES L. WICK, *Executive Publisher*
M. STANTON EVANS, *Managing Editor* FRANK CHODOROV, *Contributing Editor*

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Vol. XV, No. 51 HUMAN EVENTS December 22, 1958

Article Section I

Harold Lavine, National Editor of Newsweek and a journalistic "liberal," recently said: "Eisenhower has succeeded where Roosevelt and Truman failed. . . . The Republican party today is a thoroughly demoralized body. . . . Republican morale was able to sustain five successive defeats, but it has crumbled completely as the result of Eisenhower's two great victories." (Commentary, October, 1958.)

In the article that follows, Clarence Budington Kelland, former executive director of the Republican National Committee, former GOP National Committeeman from Arizona, and one of America's foremost writers, offers a similar view, from the standpoint of a dedicated conservative. His words express the sentiments of millions of his fellow Republicans; if they sum up your feelings as well, send copies of this article—reinforced with your own comment—to the active Republicans in your state, from precinct committeemen up to state chairmen. Write your local newspaper editor. Remember that only fear of a conservative explosion can stop the Eastern "moderns" from transforming the GOP into a completely anemic imitation of the New Deal.

EISENHOWER'S FATAL LEGACY TO THE GOP

The Road Back From The "New Republicanism"

By CLARENCE BUDINGTON KELLAND

THE BLAME FOR the disgraceful Republican defeat on Election Day should be placed squarely where it belongs—on the lap of President Dwight Eisenhower. From the day of his election he surrounded himself with advisors who desired the destruction of the Republican party as it existed from the days of Abraham Lincoln, and to substitute for it a thing called "New Republicanism." This conception of the President's was a betrayal of every principle of the party under whose banner he was elected to the Presidency.

Neither of his two elections was a victory for the Republican party; each was a curious phenomenon resulting from an unreasoning hallucination that he possessed qualities of leadership which would lift us out of the slough of socialism and statism into which we had been plunged by Roosevelt and Truman.

As a matter of tragic fact Dwight Eisenhower was a facade with no solid structure behind it. Like a stage set on a motion picture lot he presented an attractive and impressive picture; but you opened any door in the scenery and found yourself in a vacant lot.

The public, for a time, was in the grip of hysterical infatuation for an idealized personage who never existed save in its hopeful imagination. General Eisenhower, trained in the military world which had little touch with the everyday life and affairs of the people, was ill equipped to cope with practical politics. Reared in an atmosphere of uniforms and insignia, of ranks and grades in which one was trained to obey commands blindly for many years before he reached a position where he was permitted to think, he had no foundation for or experience in philosophical political reasoning. I doubt if a year before his nomination he had any idea whether he was a Republican or Democrat, or what those names signified. After six years in office that condition continues.

Upon taking office, he delegated his political thinking to cold, austere, self-righteous Sherman Adams, who insisted upon meticulous ethical purity for everyone save himself, and who, by his harshness and total lack of practical political understanding, set about the destruction of the Republican organization with diligence and skill. Under Sherman Adams' regime, the national Republican party all but ceased to exist. His great success was in alienating and affronting practically every Republican leader with whom he came in contact. If he did not set out deliberately to demolish the Republican party then his arrogance and stupidity were adequate substitutes for disloyal intention.

IT WOULD APPEAR that President Eisenhower delegated his theoretical political thinking to his devious, dangerous, left-wing brother Milton, and others of that subversive ilk. These men despised the Republican party and the decent principles which have characterized it for generations. With deliberate intention they set out to abolish the Republican party and transmute it into something that drew its purposes from a combination of pale pink parlor socialism and a scarcely concealed foundation of fabian Marxism. They called this new and treacherous sophistry "New Republicanism."

Lock, stock and barrel they sold this negation of all that was Republicanism or American to Dwight Eisenhower and he embraced it and sought, with guileless, charming personality to cram it down the throats of conservative Republicans and conservative Democrats and conserva-

Published weekly at 408 First Street, SE, Washington 3, D. C. • Copyright 1958 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tive independents, with the result that they regurgitated a Democrat-controlled Congress. The voters made choice between two evils and they decided to cling to ills they understood rather than fly to evils they knew not of.

When history comes to assay the Administration of General Eisenhower it will accuse him of incredibly stupid appointments, chief of which was that of Earl Warren as Chief Justice of the United States. With this appointment he paid a political debt that did not exist. He placed in the highest judicial position in the world a man who did not know the difference between a lawbook and the Farmers' Almanac. He placed in this man's irresponsible, selfish, ignorant hands immeasurable power. Warren seized this power and used it to legislate instead of judicate. He debauched the Supreme Court of the United States as even Franklin Roosevelt in his enmity for that body could not succeed in doing. The people of the United States saw what was being done to this great bulwark of their liberties and resented it. Their resentment was expressed at the polls. General Eisenhower could have rehabilitated our highest court. He chose, rather, to debauch it further to a point where thinking men are in rebellion against its disregard for law, Constitution and common sense.

President Eisenhower has permitted the virtual destruction of the Republican party and the undermining of our Constitution by the radical decisions of his appointed Supreme Court.

The Republican party is on its deathbed, as was the Whig party 130 years ago. Its only hope of survival is the elimination by operation of Eisenhowerism and of those who have fostered that infection. The miserable invalid gasping under its oxygen tent does not deserve to survive.

You cannot win a battle by marching under the banner of the enemy. There must be a battle line laid down which cannot be misunderstood. That line of battle must separate radical and conservative. The war must be fought out to determine which shall survive and rule the United States. This basically is a conservative country, but conservatism has had no voice to speak for it and no leadership.

Events are forcing this Nation into a struggle between radical-labor and conservatism. The only hope for survival by the remnant of the Republican party is to assert its conservatism and appeal to the Nation under that label. The issue in the next campaign must be conservatism vs. corrupt labor dictatorship.

THIS MAY BE a forlorn hope. I believe that the real hope of preserving the greatness of the United States and of maintaining those sacred rights and privileges set down in our Constitution is to jettison both parties as they exist today. Neither party has a right to the time-honored name it bears. How can the South, with its splendid history, sleep in the same bed with riffraff Northern radicals? How can the decent citizenry of the North remain under the same blanket with such fly-by-night goobledygooks as have smothered them, gagged them, rendered them futile?

It is not beyond the bounds of possibility that the conservative South will bolt the next so-called Democrat National Convention. May we not look hopefully toward the possibility that the conservative North will bolt the so-called Republican Convention? If these two armies with everything in common could unite, then their march would be irresistible.

The words Democrat and Republican are meaningless, outworn shibboleths. It is not common sense that a mere word should prevent the fusion of Southern and Northern citizens of like thinking. The South will not rally under the despised name of Republican. Let us then confer and plan, ever mindful of our duty to unborn generations, and formulate a plan to unite and fight under some name and emblem acceptable to both sections of our land.

Salvation lies in the word "conservative." Our tactics must be to force our opponents to adopt the designation of "radical-labor." Take example from the state of Arizona which, in this campaign, had courage to make of itself a political testing laboratory. Here the battle line was sharply drawn between conservative and radical-labor. The result was a tremendous, convincing victory for the right. Radicalism cannot win in these United States if conservatism goes to battle undaunted.

It is a tragic thing to be present at the deathbed of a great political party. The responsibility for this condition is a heavy weight of guilt to bear. It is a burden that must be carried by Dwight D. Eisenhower because whatever was done to slaughter the Republican party was done in his name.

Whatever slight hope remains for the recovery of the Republican party rests upon the repudiation by the remnants of that party of Eisenhowerism, New Republicanism, radicalism; and in a firm and honest declaration that it assumes the name and principles proper to the conservative party of the United States.

HUMAN EVENTS was founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. It is published weekly at 408 First Street, SE, Washington 3, D.C. and reports from Washington on politics, business, labor and taxes. It is usually published in two parts: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article. $11 per year.
TRIAL SUBSCRIPTIONS, new subscribers only: 5 weeks for $1.

ORDER BLANK

HUMAN EVENTS, 408 First Street, SE, Washington 3, D. C.

Send me ------ reprints of "EISENHOWER'S FATAL LEGACY TO THE GOP" at $ ----------.

☐ Payment enclosed ☐ Bill me

Additional copies of this 2-page Article: single copy 15c (coins not stamps); 15 copies $1; 35 copies $2; 125 copies $5; 300 copies $10; 1,000 copies $20. In 5,000 lots $15 per thousand. Unless otherwise ordered, reprints are sent by fourth-class mail, which takes ten days to two weeks for delivery. For first-class mail delivery of 2-page articles, add ½c per copy; for airmail, add 1c per copy.

Enter my subscription ☐ 5 weeks for $1 ☐ 1 year for $11

Name ----------

Street ----------

City ---------- Zone ------ State ----------

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Vol. XV, No. 51 HUMAN EVENTS December 22, 1958

Article Section II

WHAT DID JESUS BELIEVE ABOUT WEALTH?

The Authentic 'Social Gospel' Rejects Collectivism

By Rev. Irving E. Howard

SOMEONE HAS OBSERVED that no generation of Americans has thought more about freedom than ours, and none has shown a greater readiness to abandon it. This is especially true in the realm of economics. The crux of the problem of economic freedom is the nature of wealth and man's right to it.

In view of this, it is important to consider what Jesus thought about wealth. Since He was concerned with life and since economics is involved in the whole of life, we should expect to find economic implications in the teachings of Jesus. This expectation is not disappointed.

Consider Jesus' parable of the laborers in the vineyard (Matthew 20:1-6). Here is the story of an employer who hired a series of laborers at different hours of the day and at the end of the day paid them all alike. When those who had worked the longest complained because they had not been paid more than those who worked for an hour, the employer answered: "Is it not lawful for me to do what I will with my own?"

Whatever theological meaning this parable may have, it clearly assumes that a man has a right to his property. This is not a surprising assumption for Jesus to have made, for it was a central idea in the Ten Commandments and was a part of the Judaism of Jesus' time. Much so-called social legislation is in conflict with the teachings of Jesus on the question of property, for this kind of legislation is founded upon the assumption that a man's property or wealth belongs to the community, and that the community has a right to determine how it should be used. Jesus had a different idea; namely, that ultimately all property belongs to God.

Jesus also had a more constructive thought about the nature of wealth than "share the wealth." "Tax the rich" legislation assumes that there is a fixed amount of wealth which must be more evenly distributed throughout the economy if we are to have a "just" social order. Our Marxian graduated income tax operates upon that principle.

The classical economists taught that there are four ways to get property or wealth. It may be created by the sweat of one's brow or the use of one's talents. It may be traded for, received as a gift or taken by force. In simpler days, when people were so naive as to believe the Ten Commandments, taking property by force was called "stealing." In more recent times, however, we have been led to think that what may be wrong for the individual is right for the Government. According to this philosophy, if, by majority rule, the Government takes property by force, the fact that the majority voted for it makes it not an act of theft, but an expression of "social consciousness."

NO ONE WHO is serious about the teachings of Jesus can ever be happy with this socialistic teaching. Not only did Jesus not believe in stealing, he did not believe that wealth was static. Study the parable of the ten pounds. Here Jesus told the story of a nobleman who gave his ten servants one pound each before he left for the far country. Upon his return, he called them to account. All but one had invested and increased his pound. This servant had hoarded his in fear that he might lose even that one pound. His lack of enterprise was condemned (Luke 19:11-28).

Thus, from Jesus' point of view, if one man has less wealth than another, he may get more, not by robbing the man who has more, but by creating some for himself. The only limitation upon the amount of wealth in existence is in man's ingenuity for creation. In this parable, the more the servants made on their investment, the more they were applauded, and there is no suggestion that there was anything immoral in their creation of wealth. Only sloth, fear and hoarding were condemned.

Jesus' attitude toward wealth was conditioned by an otherworldliness. He was not primarily interested in this present world, but in a world to come. Therefore, when a man came to Jesus saying: "Master, speak to my brother, that he divide the inheritance with me," Jesus rebuked the man and refused to be an equalizer of wealth. He continued by warning the man against covetousness.

Jesus had not heard about the Social Gospel, so his response to this challenge did not reveal an "enlightened social consciousness." It is odd that the covetousness Jesus warned against so frequently has been turned into a virtue by the Social Gospel and Social Action movement in the

Published weekly at 408 First Street, SE, Washington 3, D. C. • Copyright 1958 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

modern church. Jesus followed his warning against covetousness with the parable of the rich fool who built ever larger barns only to die suddenly, unprepared for eternity (Luke 12:13-21).

To Jesus, wealth was a threat to the soul of the possessor, not a problem to be solved by social engineering. His focal point was always upon the individual rather than the group. While what he said to the individual had wide social consequences, he always started with the individual. So how to use wealth was a problem for the individual to solve with a sense of stewardship to God.

Consider the rich young ruler who asked Jesus what he should do to inherit eternal life. Jesus recited the Ten Commandments, to which the rich young ruler replied: "I have kept these from my youth up." To prove that he had not understood the full implication of them, particularly the first, Jesus replied: "If thou wilt be perfect, go and sell that thou hast, give to the poor . . . and follow me." Note that the point of emphasis in this incident was not upon the welfare of the poor, but upon the welfare the rich young ruler's soul. He had made a god of wealth (Matthew 19:16-26).

Jesus was for neither the poor nor the rich. He was for all men as individuals. Most of all, he was for their spiritual development and commanded charity as a means to that development. In Jesus' hands, the Old Testament doctrine of the sovereignty of God became a warm, personal faith in the providence of God. While expounding upon God's willingness to care for those who trust Him, Jesus enunciated one of the greatest truths of the New Testament: "Seek ye first the Kingdom of God and His righteousness and all these things shall be added unto you" (Matthew 6:33).

Man's accountability to God in the use of his wealth obligates him to practice charity, which was the point of the story of Dives and Lazarus. The rich man in this story was punished, not because he was wealthy, but because he did not have compassion upon the beggar at his gate. Nevertheless, there is no suggestion in this story that Lazarus had any claim upon the rich man's wealth (Luke 16:19-31). Emil Brunner has stated it well in *Justice and the Social Order*: "[Man] is obliged, not by justice, but by compassion, to give to those who are in need out of what is entirely his property, but those in need have no right to it . . ."

The best-known example of Jesus' insistence upon charity is the parable of the Good Samaritan (Luke 10:25-37). A close examination of this story reveals that, while it was given in answer to the lawyer's question, "Who is my neighbor?" it answered an unasked question: "Who is it that acts neighborly?" In *The Peril of Modernizing Jesus*, Dr. Henry Joel Cadbury made the point that Jesus shifted the emphasis from the recipient to the doer of the deed. The spirit of compassion was more important to Jesus than the act of getting a wounded man taken care of on the Jericho road.

THESE DISTINCTIONS are vital. Too frequently we have made the mistake of thinking that Christian ethics is concerned only with the objective deed, the consequences, rather than with the subjective motivation.

Dr. W. A. Visser 't Hooft, Secretary of the World Council of Churches, has criticized our American tendency in this regard: "When the objective deed is valued in the social result rather than in its motivation, it becomes possible to interpret a number of manifestations of social life as Christian (because of their apparent social value) that in the conception of ethics which stakes everything upon the inner attitude would never deserve the name." "The greatest treason," said Thomas à Becket in Eliot's *Murder in the Cathedral*, "is to do the right thing for the wrong reason." Much social welfare legislation provides us with examples of both wrong things and wrong reasons.

The teachings of Jesus are still relevant and contain the truth that makes men free. Man is a spiritual being, not a materialistic mechanism. Man is responsible to God beyond all other authorities. As such, man has inalienable rights to life, liberty and property, which rights no government can give and no government should take away. This is the true Social Gospel.

Rev. Irving E. Howard, an ordained Congregational minister, is a Freedoms Foundation award winner. He is now on the staff of *Christian Economics*, in which this article first appeared. "What Did Jesus Believe About Wealth?" was first reprinted in the June 4, 1955, issue of HUMAN EVENTS, and quickly became a best-seller.

HUMAN EVENTS was founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. It is published weekly at 408 First Street, SE, Washington 3, D.C. and reports from Washington on politics, business, labor and taxes. It is usually published in two parts: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article. $11 per year.
TRIAL SUBSCRIPTIONS, new subscribers only: 5 weeks for $1.

ORDER BLANK

HUMAN EVENTS, 408 First Street, SE, Washington 3, D. C.

Send me _____ reprints of "WHAT DID JESUS BELIEVE ABOUT WEALTH?" at $ _____.

☐ Payment enclosed ☐ Bill me

Additional copies of this 2-page Article: single copy 15c (coins not stamps); 15 copies $1; 35 copies $2; 125 copies $5; 300 copies $10; 1,000 copies $20. In 5,000 lots $15 per thousand. Unless otherwise ordered, reprints are sent by fourth-class mail, which takes ten days to two weeks for delivery. For first-class mail delivery of 2-page articles, add ½c per copy; for airmail, add 1c per copy.

Enter my subscription ☐ 5 weeks for $1 ☐ 1 year for $11

Name _____

Street _____

City _____ Zone _____ State _____

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED